



AGC/WSDOT ROADWAY TEAM

Meeting Minutes: March 6, 2008 Meeting

Attending:

X	Frank Scarsella	X	Mike Bradley		Bill Grady
	Scott Stephens		Bob Glenn	X	Dan Glover
X	James Prouty		Dan Howell		
X	Jim Spaid	X	Derek Case	X	Mike Morishige
X	Gil McNabb	X	Ken Stone		Bob Romine
	Paul Bennett	X	Casey Liles		Kurt Williams

Introductions

Minutes of March 6, 2008 meeting:

Minutes of other Team Meetings:

The meeting notes from the last AGC Roadway Team meeting held on January 17, 2008 were passed out and briefly reviewed. There were no comments or corrections.

The minutes of the January 18, 2008 Administration Team meeting were passed out.

The minutes of the January 25, 2008 Structures Team meeting were passed out. There were no comments.

Old Business

Erosion Control Fall Assessment and SPCC Review

Ken Stone of the HQ Environmental Services Office gave a presentation on the results of the annual Fall Assessment of Erosion Control Preparedness. The assessment takes place in October of each year at the onset of fall rains. It is intended to provide valuable feedback to project teams with regard to their erosion control preparedness as well as an overall measurement tool for agency wide performance. The results are included in the annual Gray Notebook. Projects chosen for the assessment are those with higher potential for erosion due to their size, slopes, soil type and proximity to sensitive waterways. 30 projects were reviewed throughout the state – 4 in eastern Washington and the remaining 26 in western Washington. Overall, this year's performance (fall 2007) was improved over the previous year, a very good sign. However, areas for improvement remain. The two most common

issues were: maintenance of access roads and maintenance of BMPs (specifically - silt fence, construction entrances, & grate inlet protection). Ken asked for feedback from the Regional DOT members. Mike Morishige agreed that the assessment was generally positive and helpful, but needs to be viewed in the proper context – that it is only a measure of what was observed on the specific day of the assessment, not necessarily representative of overall practice on a given project site. Gil McNabb stated that the assessment was seen as positive in NW Region and many projects had taken advantage of the offered follow up visit by the HQ Stormwater and Water Quality section as they addressed specific issues found in her first visit.

Ken went on to his next topic, the first annual SPCC plan assessment. Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures Plans have been a specification requirement for seven years now and are also a permit requirement from the State Department of Ecology. Contractors on WSDOT Projects are to prepare and submit them for Project Engineer approval on all projects. This assessment was a series of questions asked of the project office at 17 different projects. Unfortunately, only 2 projects had SPCC plans that met all the specification requirements. A list of common problems was provided in a handout. Ken agreed to provide a copy of the questions used to help future projects to be better prepared. Discussion ensued regarding the definition of a ‘spill’ and what was considered reportable. Responses varied, but there appeared to be some issues with strict interpretation of the requirements. E.g. – if some concrete falls outside a form, is it a spill? If a piece of equipment drips on the ground, is it a spill? Jim Spaid pointed out that Ken was going to prepare a set of guidelines to help project offices know how to handle these occurrences.

New Business

Jim Spaid handed out copies of several specification changes to be released in the next publication.

Sections 8-01.3(1)C, 8-01.3(6)D and 8-01.3(13) – Draft revisions to address high pH process water and TESC bmp specifications.

Structural Earth Walls – Revisions to the material specs for the MSE Plus proprietary wall system.

HMA Volumetrics GSP – Revisions to provide consistency with Standard Specs

Section 2-02.3(3) – draft amendment to allow planing equipment in lieu of saw cutting for pavement removal

Section 2-01.3(1) – Amendment to clarify ambiguity between clearing and grubbing

These revisions were accepted by the group without comment.

Jim next handed out a series of draft revisions to the pavement marking specifications and requested a review and comments from the team members.

The first was a wholesale revision to Standard Specification section 8-22, Pavement Marking.

The second was a revision to the beading segment of Standard Specification 8-23, Temporary Pavement Markings.

The third was a draft GSP for the addition of Plural Component Pavement Markings to Standard Specification section 8-22. These are new products that HQ Traffic hopes to test on the mountain passes as they may prove to be more durable. Because no striping contractors were in attendance, Jim Spaid and Dan Glover agreed to forward copies of the draft changes to Apply-A-Line, Stripe Rite and Road Runner for their comments.

Other Business

No comments from around the table.

Next Meeting Dates: – April 17, 2008 and May 22, 2008